

LAW OFFICES
BLOOSTON, MORDKOFKY, DICKENS, DUFFY & PRENDERGAST
2120 L STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

HAROLD MORDKOFKY
BENJAMIN H. DICKENS, JR.
JOHN A. PRENDERGAST
GERARD J. DUFFY
RICHARD D. RUBINO
MARY J. SISAK
D. CARY MITCHELL
DOUGLAS W. EVERETTE

(202) 659-0830
FACSIMILE: (202) 828-5568

June 18, 2003

ARTHUR BLOOSTON
1914 – 1999

AFFILIATED SOUTH AMERICAN OFFICES

ESTUDIO JAUREGUI & ASSOCIATES
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

ROBERT M. JACKSON
OF COUNSEL

PERRY W. WOOFER
LEGISLATIVE CONSULTANT

EUGENE MALISZEWSKYJ
DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING
PRIVATE RADIO

Ex Parte

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
236 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Suite 110
Washington, DC 20002

**Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation:
CC Docket Nos. 95-116, 96-45**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On June 18, 2003, the South Dakota Telecommunications Association, Inc. (SDTA) met with Commissioner Martin and Dan Gonzalez. On behalf of SDTA, Rich Coit, Executive Director and its counsel, Benjamin Dickens and Mary Sisak were in attendance.

SDTA discussed its comments filed in the universal service proceeding and the CTIA Petition for Declaratory Ruling on local number portability, as reflected in the attachment to this notice. In addition, SDTA discussed the pending proceeding concerning whether equal access to interexchange service should be added to the list of supported services.

Consistent with section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, we are filing one electronic copy of this notice in each of the above-captioned proceedings and request that you place it in the appropriate record of those proceedings.

Sincerely,

/s/
Mary J. Sisak

cc: Commissioner Kevin J. Martin
Dan Gonzalez

Attachment

SDTA POSITION ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE

- I. Support to rural ILECs should be provided based on the actual cost of total facilities.
- II. All lines must be supported.
- III. The identical support rule does not comply with the universal service principles.
 - a. It is not competitively neutral.
 - b. It results in excessive support.
- IV. High cost support should not be based on auctions.
- V. The public interest determination should include a cost/benefit analysis of supporting multiple carriers in rural areas.
 - a. This should include an analysis of whether quality services at affordable rates can continue to be provided by all ETCs if an additional ETC is designated, without relying on an increasing level of support.
 - b. The FCC and states should examine whether support will be used for supported services.
 - c. ETC status should be granted to competitors in rural areas only if they offer service throughout the ILEC's study area.

**SDTA POSITION ON CTIA LNP PETITIONS
CC DOCKET NO. 95-116**

- I. Grant of CTIA's Petitions would have consequences beyond LNP
 - a. CTIA's petition could force changes in ILEC local calling areas and/or rating of calls, which could impact ILEC revenues.
 - b. CTIA's petition would create an unlawful disparity in numbering portability and give a significant competitive advantage to wireless carriers.
 - c. Interconnection agreements are necessary before number porting to ensure appropriate cost recovery.
 - d. The FCC should retain the bona fide request requirement.
 - e. A short porting interval as requested by CTIA is not possible today and would require significant and costly network modifications
- II. The FCC should implement a rulemaking proceeding to ensure a full analysis of the issues.